

# THE CONSPIRACY TO BREAK UP THE UNION.

---

## THE PLOT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT.

---

### BRECKINRIDGE AND LANE THE CANDIDATES OF A DIS UNION PARTY.

---

✎ LET THE MASSES READ AND PONDER. ✎

*From the Nashville (Tenn.) Patriot.*

The first serious attempt to dissolve the Union and revolutionize the Government of this Republic was made by the State of South Carolina in 1832-'33. It met with no sympathy outside of that State, and Gen. JACKSON, then President, gave it an effectual quietus. The advocates of secession, at that day, and in that State, were forced to retire from the unequal contest in disgrace, or surrender their position, and to address themselves to the correction of what they conceived to be evil and injustice in a constitutional way. Hence we heard but little more of secession and disunion for nearly twenty years.

In 1850-'51, however, the agitation of the question of slavery growing out of the acquisition of territory from Mexico, gave rise to a state of feeling between the North and the South, which was fearfully violent. There was, before that time, a latent spirit of enmity toward the Union, lurking in the breasts of a few discontented and restless spirits—of which it is sufficient evidence to recite the course of Mr. WILLIAM L. YANCEY in an effort to break up the Baltimore Democratic Convention of 1848. The agitation of 1850 was disposed of by the series of acts passed by Congress during that year, familiarly known to the country as the "Compromise Measures." Upon the passage of these the small disunion faction suddenly rose to an importance which it had never attained before. In several of the southern States, in elections following, the issue was made of submission to those measures, or dissolution of the Union. The question was discussed before the people, and every effort made to fire the public mind, to arouse the popular passions, and to bring about a violent disruption of the Government. It was at this time that Hon. JEFFERSON DAVIS, now the leading secessionist in the national legislature, declared that "he was for resistance, and would never submit to the stain of degradation" which those measures, in his estimation, imposed. He ran as a candidate for governor of Mississippi on that issue, and was defeated before the people. In other States similar issues were made, and the people throughout the South placed the seal of their condemnation upon the enemies of the

Union at the ballot-box. While this excited feeling was at its highest pitch, a southern convention was called to convene in this city, to extend the spirit of disunion, and to make it paramount in the southern States. It also resulted in an ignominious failure. Wherever, and in whatever shape the issue was presented to the people, it was rejected with scorn and indignation.

Thus covered with defeat, baffled at every point, rejected, spurned, and driven from place and the hope of place, the disunionists retired from the contest in humiliation and shame. In 1852, they, with the same hypocritical solemnity which distinguishes their present professions of love, and admiration, and friendship for the Union, met with the Democracy in National Convention, and proclaimed that the "Compromise Measures" of 1850, were a just and final settlement of the slavery question. They gave their adhesion to the Union, as they now pretend to do, and declared they would shed their blood in its defence. We heard no more of injustice, aggression, and unconstitutional enactments. But now the spirit of treason and disunion is again abroad in our land. It now has no congressional compromise as a point of attack, as a rallying cry. But the enemies of the Union have what they imagine will serve their purpose equally as well. They now hold that the election of a Black Republican to the Presidency, is a just cause for secession, disunion, and revolution. They have cultivated this idea for several years—not the people, for such a thing has scarcely been seriously considered by them, but the leaders. It is the inception of this idea and the means to be used to bring that contingency about, that is the purpose of this article, and to present the evidence of a preconcerted, cold-blooded, deliberate, heartless conspiracy to break up the union of these United States. We propose to present such an array of facts, as will satisfy all that it is the purpose of certain of the leaders of the Baltimore secession movement which nominated BRECKINRIDGE for the Presidency, to overthrow and terminate the existing government of the United States.

We begin this array by citing a fact, which was disclosed for the first time in Knoxville, in

this State, on the occasion of a Union meeting held in that city in the month of January last. Judge BAILEY, who was a citizen of Georgia, until within a short time previous to that time, delivered a speech on that occasion, in which, according to the Knoxville *Whig*:

"He said, that during the Presidential contest, Governor WISE had addressed letters to all the southern governors—and that the one to the governor of Florida, had been shown him—in which WISE said that *he had an army in readiness to prevent Fremont from taking his seat, if elected*, and asking the co-operation of those to whom he wrote!"\*

Here we have the fact that it has been in contemplation from the first national struggle after the organization of the Republican party, to resist the inauguration of a member of that party as President of the United States, though he were elected fairly by the people, under the sanctions and all the forms prescribed by the Federal Constitution, WITHOUT AWAITING ANY HOSTILE DEMONSTRATION, OR ANY OVERT ACT *which should justify a resort to such extremities.*

We next trace the course of WILLIAM L. YANCEY, of Alabama, who is now the recognized leader in the secession movements in the Charleston and Baltimore Democratic Conventions, which eventuated in the nomination of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE for the Presidency. Though a disorganizer in 1848, and a disunionist in 1850-51, we begin our quotations from his outgivings with the 10th of May, 1858, as it was only then that he began to prepare actively to consummate the aim which had a partial fruition at Baltimore. On that day, the Southern Convention met in the city of Montgomery. At the opening of that Convention, he delivered an address of welcome to the delegates, of which the subjoined is an extract:

"I must be allowed, at least on my own behalf, to welcome you too, as but the foreshadowing of that far more important body; important as you evidently will be, that if injustice and wrong shall continue to rule the hour and councils of the dominant section of the country, must, ere

\* NOTE.—The following letter of Gov. WISE to Gov. LIGON is a copy of the letter addressed to the Governors of certain southern States, in 1856:

"RICHMOND, VA., Sept. 15, 1856.

"DEAR SIR: Events are approaching which address themselves to your responsibilities and to mine as chief executives of slaveholding States. Contingencies may soon happen which would require preparation for the worst of evils to the people. Ought we not to admonish ourselves by joint counsel of the extraordinary duties which may devolve upon us from the dangers which so palpably threaten our common peace and safety? When, how, or to what extent may we act, separately or unitedly, to ward off dangers if we can, to meet them most effectually if we must?"

"I propose that, as early as convenient, the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Tennessee, shall assemble at Raleigh, N. C., for the purpose generally of consultation upon the state of the country, upon the best means of preserving its peace, and especially of protecting the honor and interests of the slaveholding States. I have addressed the States only having Democratic Executives, for obvious reasons.

"This should be done as early as possible, before the Presidential election, and I would suggest Monday, the 18th of October next. Will you please give me an early answer, and oblige

"Yours, most truly and respectfully,

"HENRY A. WISE.

"His Excellency Thomas W. Ligon,  
"Governor of Maryland."

long, assemble upon southern soil for the purpose of devising some measure by which not only your industrial, but your social and political relations shall be placed upon the basis of an *independent sovereignty*, which will have within itself a unity of climate, a unity of soil, a unity of production, and a unity of social relations; that unity which alone can be the basis of a successful and permanent government."

At that session the chief topic of discussion in the convention was the reopening of the American slave trade, and a general exposition of the supposed wrongs of the South. Mr. Yancey had a good opportunity of conferring with the ultraists of other southern States, on the subject of secession and disunion, which, we are led to believe, he industriously improved. For within about a month afterward he addressed a letter to Mr. JAS. S. SLAUGHTER, dated June 15th, 1858, which is as follows:

"MONTGOMERY, June 15, 1860.

"DEAR SIR: Your kind letter of the 15th inst. is received. I hardly agree with you that a general movement can be made that will clean out the Augean stable. If the Democracy were overthrown, it would result in giving place to a greater and hungrier swarm of flies. The remedy of the South is not such a process. It is in a diligent organization of her true men, for prompt resistance to the next aggression. It must come in the nature of things. *No national party can save us; no sectional party can do it. But if we could do as our fathers did, organize committees of safety all over the cotton States, (and it is only in them that we can hope for any effective movement) we shall fire the southern heart—instruct the southern mind—give courage to each other, and at the proper moment, by one organized concerted action, we can precipitate the cotton States into a revolution.*

"The idea has been shadowed forth in the South by Mr. Ruffin—has been taken up and recommended in the *Advertiser*, under the name of 'League of United Southerners,' who, keeping up their old party relations on all other questions, will hold the southern issue paramount, and will influence parties, legislatures, and statesmen. I have no time to enlarge, but suggest merely.

"In haste, yours, &c.,

"W. L. YANCEY.

"To Jos. S. SLAUGHTER, Esq.,  
"Atlanta, Georgia."

He had evidently now pretty well matured his scheme, but still held himself open to friendly suggestions. So far as the plot had gone, its diabolical excellence was never surpassed. Mr. Ruffin had agreed to it, and the Montgomery *Advertiser* had taken it up and recommended it. The masses of the people who were to second and sustain the treason, were to retain their party relations on other questions—they were to give their entire faith to their leaders, have their passions duly aroused by fiery appeals, and at "the proper moment, *we* (the leaders) *can* precipitate the cotton States into a revolution." Mr. YANCEY lost no time in setting on foot the proposed organization, and to enlist the masses under his disunion and revolutionary banner. On the 10th of July following, he repaired to the country, and at Bethel church, in the county of Montgomery, delivered an address to the people who had assembled to hear him. His theme, of course, was the wrongs and oppressions of the South. At the conclusion of his speech a "League" was formed, under the following Constitution, as a basis of organization:

"1. The members of this organization shall be known as the '*Leaguers of the South*;' and our motto shall be, A SOUTHERN REPUBLIC IS OUR ONLY SAFETY.

"2. There shall be primary leagues, State leagues, and a league of the southern States.

\* \* \* \* \*

"12. No league shall ever nominate a candidate for any office of profit or of honor under the Federal or any State government; but each league shall vote according to his own conscience, remembering always his duty to the South."

This was the Organization set on foot among the masses, which was to "control parties, legislatures, and statesmen." To what extent and how rapidly it succeeded, we have no means of knowing; but subsequent events would indicate that Mr. Yancey thought the plot had grown to be wide and strong enough to warrant a bold attempt to sectionize the country in the present presidential campaign. In the meantime, the revolutionary letter to Mr. Slaughter having been published in the newspapers, and being severely criticised by the *Richmond South*, Mr. YANCEY wrote a letter to the editor, Mr. ROGER A. PRYOR, of Virginia, by way of defence and explanation, in the course of which he says:

"It is equally true that I do not expect Virginia to take any initiative steps toward a dissolution of the Union, when that exigency shall be forced upon the South. Her position as a border State and a well-considered southern policy (a policy which has been digested and understood and approved by the ablest men in Virginia, as you yourself must be aware,) would seem to demand that, when such a movement takes place by any inconsiderable number of southern States, Virginia and the other border States should remain in the Union, where, by their position and their counsels, they could prove more effective friends than by moving out of the Union, and thus giving the southern confederacy, a long abolition, hostile border to watch. In the event of the movement being successful, in time Virginia, and the other border States that desired it, could join the southern confederacy, and be protected by the power of its affrmance and its diplomacy."

Here we have the important disclosure that the scheme had been submitted to, understood and approved by, the ablest men in Virginia, and that Mr. Pryor was also then in the secret. In publishing this extract on the 9th of September, 1858, in the columns of the *Patriot*, we asked Mr. Pryor the question, "who are these ablest men in Virginia who had digested, understood, and approved" this well considered southern policy? And though we exchanged with the *South*, and doubtless it was cognizant of the question, he failed to answer. Undoubtedly Gov. WISE was one of the men referred to, as a circumstance presently to be mentioned will more fully show.

The foregoing completely demonstrates that a preconceived, deliberately planned and organized scheme to break up the Union of the States was concocted, taking its shape from secret consultations held by men from various southern States, during the sitting of the southern convention at Montgomery, Alabama, in 1858. It also shows that WILLIAM L. YANCEY, the head and front of the BRECKINRIDGE party at the South, was the leading spirit in the wicked and traitorous proceeding. It also proves, beyond question, that the entire design, plot, and aim, rested, in its inception, on no ground other than cold-blooded enmity to the Union, and the pretence that disunion *per se*, of itself and without cause, would be of advantage to the South. But no one ever suspected Mr. YANCEY of a lack of sense. He well knew that the whole conspiracy would fail, and that he and his coadjutors would be overwhelmed with disgrace unless the people could be brought up to its support. The plan

was all perfect, except that it had no immediate pretext. He had introduced into the southern convention at Montgomery, or procured to be introduced, resolutions in favor of reopening the African slave trade; but it was soon found that such a pretext alone would not meet the popular acceptance and approval, and that it could not be relied on to answer the purpose. Another, more directly affecting the people, was absolutely necessary. Fortunately for Mr. YANCEY and his fellow-conspirators, one, supposed to be suitable in all respects, was found in the idea of congressional protection to slavery in the Territories.—About the 10th of September, 1858, the *New Orleans Delta*, a well known disunion paper, cautiously put forward the doctrine of congressional protection.

It was shortly taken up by other journals, and in the first days of January, 1858, it was formally promulgated by the *Richmond Enquirer*. Here the finger of Gov. WISE is plainly discernible. But a short time previous he had approved the course of Mr. DOUGLAS in his split with the Administration, and the sudden change of front by his organ shows an undoubted understanding that the doctrine of congressional protection was to be made, for the first time, an *issue in party politics*.

The parties of this disunion intrigue perfectly well knew that the proposition was impracticable—that there was no reasonable hope of bringing Congress, under existing circumstances, to grant the demand. They knew, also, that it would inevitably create a division of the Democratic party, whereby it would be demoralized and denationalized. At the time they did not know, however, that the present Union movement would be so successfully brought forward. The calculation was to break up the Democratic party (as Mr. YANCEY intimated in his "Slaughter Letter") to excite violent sectional antagonism, to unite the North against the South, and the South against the North, and thus insure the election of the Republican candidate. Upon this event, thus designedly effected, the programme was and is to resist his inauguration, and bring on the final catastrophe. At this juncture, JEFFERSON DAVIS appears upon the stage to play his part in the infamous drama. In the autumn of 1858, on his return from a tour through the northern and eastern States, he delivered an address at Jackson, Mississippi, in which he broached the idea of a disunion in the event of the election of a Republican. This was the first declaration of this purpose by a leading man. He thus stated it:

"If an abolitionist be chosen President of the United States, you will have presented to you the question of whether you will permit the Government to pass into the hands of your avowed and implacable enemies? Without pausing for your answer, I will state my own position to be that such a result would be a species of revolution by which the purposes of the Government would be destroyed, and the observance of its mere forms entitled to no respect. In that event, in such manner as should be most expeditious, I should deem it your duty to provide for your SAFETY OUTSIDE OF THE UNION, with those who have already shown the will, and would have acquired the power, to deprive you of your birthright, and to reduce you to worse than the colonial dependence of your fathers."

The next step was to go actively into the work of indoctrinating the masses with the idea of Congressional protection in slavery in the Territories, and to enforce the propriety of resistance to the inauguration of a Republican President; and to this the year 1859 and a portion of this were industriously devoted. In the early part of the year 1859, the newspapers began to prepare the public mind for the issues connected, in the manner above recited, and to be enforced by the leaders during the then approaching summer campaign. We now group a few expressions from that source:

*From the Mobile Mercury, April, 1859.*

"The times are now ripe for the organization of a political movement in the slave-holding States, irrespective, of course, of all old party designations; and there are peculiar reasons why such a movement should be undertaken now and here. Indeed, we are credibly informed that conferences have already been held by leading patriotic gentlemen of this city, of all parties, and the plans of a southern organization have been set on foot and almost matured, preparatory to action. We earnestly hope the good work may go on, and speedily.

"The country, we repeat, is ripe for the movement, and if judiciously inaugurated, it will sweep over the land with a force that no opposition will be able to check. We therefore caution our friends in the country everywhere, to be prepared for it, and to keep themselves from all entangling alliances which may hinder them from joining in it untrammelled."

The Charleston Mercury, in April, 1859, said of the Democratic Presidential convention of the present year, "Unless it is limited exclusively to delegates from the South, it will be no convention of the Democratic party." How truly it spoke the disunion sentiment late events have fully shown.

*From the New Orleans Delta, April, 1859.*

"In 1860 the South and the North are to be arrayed in deadly contest; the battle of the sections is then to be fought for the last time, and its issue is to be decisive of our fate."

*From the Montgomery Advertiser, March, 1859.*

"It is important that we should send such men to represent us (in Congress) as possess the ability to combat the approaches of Republicanism, and the nerve to secede from Washington in case abolitionism should instil one of its leaders in the Executive mansion of the nation. It is important to the South also, that her delegation should present a united front of State-rights Democrats, for in the principles and the doctrines of the State-rights Democracy rest the hope of the South, in the Union as out of it."

*From the Eufala (Ala.) Gazette, March, 1859.*

"Could we all think and feel alike; were our interests identical and our occupations similar, we might adopt a common government without detriment to either; but, as we are different in all these, it becomes us to prepare for an immediate withdrawal from the alliance which has hitherto held us together; and we hold it to be the first duty, as it should be the first object of southern statesmen and the southern press, to inaugurate a southern confederacy and thereby establish southern independence."

*From the Washington Correspondent of the Charleston Mercury, March, 1859.*

"There are of the members of Congress from the different States of the South, a number of staunch State-rights men. As the Democratic party goes to pieces, these will form the nucleus of a southern organization which must be formed to meet the aggressions of northern consolidation through the general Government. \* \* There can be no doubt that the politicians, no less than the people of the South are strengthening in the opinion that nothing is left but taking their destinies in their own keeping. Yet there is a great reluctance to acknowledge

the truth, and men hide their eyes to it as long as possible. By the end of the next session we may look to be out of the woods. When the Democratic party is resolved into its northern and southern elements, now incongruously joined for the sake of the spoils, then the South will wheel into line for the defence of her rights on the positions occupied by the State-rights men."

*From the Eufala Spirit of the South, March, 1859.*

"The North and South agreeing about some things and differing about others, made a Union for their benefit and a Constitution for their common government. The Supreme Court, who, according to the established creed of the North, are the final exponents of that Constitution, say that by its provisions slavery is protected in the Territories, but the greater portion of the North denounces that decision openly, while the remainder covertly repudiate it. What remains, then, but to do that which has been done in all ages and countries, by sensible and right-minded people, who have the misfortune to differ irreconcilably—TO SEPARATE."

*From the Charleston Mercury, May, 1859.*

"A revolution is, therefore, inevitable. Submission or resistance will alike establish it. The old Union—the Union of the Constitution, of equal rights between sovereign States is abolished. It is gone forever; strangled by consolidation, and now the instrument of centralism, to establish an irresponsible despotism of the North over the South. To break up the present Union and establish another of the South alone, is no greater revolution than that which now exists. In fact it will be a lesser change. Let the struggle come when it may, the South, to achieve her safety, will have to trample down a Union party in the track of her political emancipation."

The above extract from the Washington correspondent of the Charleston Mercury, so clearly foreshadows the very events which have since transpired, that the conclusion is almost irresistible that there was a junta of these disunionists in the city of Washington, who had, at that early day, arranged the entire course to be pursued. The newspapers were promptly and vigorously seconded by the leaders. Below we subjoin outgivings of a portion of those leaders, to indicate the progress of the work of perfecting an organization which should "control parties, legislatures and statesmen."

On the 18th April, 1859, Judge H. S. BENNETT, a very prominent man in North Mississippi, in a letter to the editor of the Grenada Locomotive, says:

"Since 1850, it has been my opinion, and recent events have more than confirmed this opinion, that we have but little hope in looking to a Federal Congress for the protection of our rights. In every combat we have lost ground; in every argument our forces have been weakened; in every compromise we have been the dupes of northern fanaticism. If we ask for the application of the doctrine of non-intervention, we are presented with the hideous ghost of squatter sovereignty. If we ask for the protection of our slaves in the Territories, we are told we can have none save what a lawless rabble in the Territories may see proper to give us.

"It may, then, be asked, to whom can we appeal? If to the guarantees of the Constitution, we are insulted and told the North has yielded to us the fugitive slave bill, and with that we should be contented. If we demand the rendition of our fugitive slaves, we are pointed to their statute books, to laws nullifying the laws of Congress.

"With a full knowledge of all these facts, I appeal to every fair minded man in the South, if it is not time to cease this idle talk, and let our demand be made known in language that cannot be misunderstood, demanding congressional legislation for the protection of slaves in the Territories, as being in unison with the plainest principles of justice, equal rights, common sense and the mandates of the Constitution.

"This being refused, as our common right under the compact, in the Union; then let us seek equality outside of the compact of Union, where the laws of God, the rights of man, and the feelings of free men counsel us unerringly that we should seek our redress.

"And having, as I do, but the faintest hope that this reasonable demand will be granted, may I not justly conclude that it is futile to fix our hopes upon Congress for protection and aid? I answer, to ourselves, to the means within our reach, to the proper organization of our own State."

Hon. JOHN J. PETERS, the present Governor of Mississippi, during his canvass for that office last year, delivered speeches in all sections in the State, in each of which he declared that in the event of the election of a Republican to the Presidency, he was for a dissolution of the Union. The Vicksburg *Whig*, having been informed that Gov. PETERS had stated "that in the event of his election to the Governorship, and a Republican should be elected to the office of President of the United States, he would await some hostile demonstration towards the South before advising resistance," the Jackson *Mississippian* replied:

"The informant of the *Whig* is clearly in error. Col. PETERS, at all times and places, in his public speeches and private conversations, in his open declarations to the people at the hustings and in his councils with his friends, declares, without reservation or qualification, his approval of the platform that nominated him, pledging the State to resistance in the event of the election of a Black-Republican to the Presidency, upon the avowed purposes of the anti-slavery organization. In his speech at Scooba, in his own county, on the 6th inst., (August,) he went so far as to declare, according to the *DeKalb Democrat*, whose editor was present and reported his remarks, that, "although he now held, as it were, the chief magistracy of the State in his hands, he would freely give it up and retire from the canvass, if he thought the people would not sustain him in STRONG RESISTANCE TO THE INAGURATION OF A BLACK REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT."

In July, 1859, the following questions were propounded to Hon. L. P. WALKER, of Alabama, one of the seceders at Charleston and Baltimore, by the editor of the Huntsville *Advocate*:

"1. Is it the duty of Congress to intervene for the protection of slavery in the Territories of the United States?"

"2. Are you in favor of a repeal of the laws of Congress which declare the foreign slave trade piracy?"

"3. What position should the southern Democracy assume in the Charleston Convention?"

The first two he answered in the affirmative, and to the third replied:

"We should insist upon adopting a platform before making the nomination. This platform must embody the first of the foregoing propositions, and should embrace, in principle, the second also. If the first of these propositions—viz: protection to slavery in the territories—is not adopted, the South should withdraw from the convention and make its own nominations, and enunciate a platform of principles consistent with the dignity of sovereign States and the great right of self-protection. \* \* \* We have a mission to fulfill, "ennobled by its danger and purified by its isolation."

"With this spirit let the crisis come!

Be bold, united, firmly set;

Nor flinch in word or tone;

We'll be a glorious people yet—

Redeemed—erect—alone!

On the 9th of May, 1859, the Southern Convention—an institution which figures conspicuously in this treasonable business—met at Vicksburg, Mississippi. Ex-Governor McRAE, ex-Senator and present member of Congress from that State, being ill and unable to attend, gave it his encouragement by sending to it a letter of regret, in which he enclosed a series of resolutions, of which the following touches the main matter in hand:

"Resolved, That the success of the Republican party in the election of a President of the United States by a sectional majority in 1860 upon the principles above

declared will be a virtual dissolution of the compact of the existing Union of the States; and in that event this convention recommends to the people of the slaveholding States to meet immediately in connection to determine the mode and measure of upholding the constitutional government as it at present exists, by preventing the installation into office of a Republican President and the inauguration of the Republican party in power; or, failing in that, to resolve the slaveholding States into a separate independent organization, with such constitutional form of government as will best secure their safety, their honor, their rights and institutions, and make them a power of the earth."

On another occasion he said:

"If the Douglas construction of the Cincinnati platform prevailed at Charleston, I, for one, would not submit. I AM FOR INDEPENDENCE OUT OF THE UNION IN PREFERENCE TO DISHONOR IT."

Again, on the eve of his departure for Washington, on the 19th of November, he spoke at Jackson, Mississippi—which the *Mississippian* reported thus:

"With his accustomed candor, Ex-Governor McRAE avowed himself in favor of the repeal of the Federal and State laws branding as an ignominious crime the purchase of slaves in Africa, thereby constituting a system of legislation unfriendly to southern institutions, and detrimental to southern interests. In the event of the election of a Black-Republican to the Presidency, the speaker argued that *Mississippi separately, or in concert with other Southern States, as she might elect, ought at once to discontinue her connection with the Abolition States.*"

Hon. R. BARNWELL RHETT, of South Carolina, also lent his helping hand, the same who said, shortly after the election of Mr. BUCHANAN: "All true statesmanship in the South consists in forming combinations and shaping events so as to bring about a dissolution of the present Union and the establishment of a southern confederacy." He made a speech on the 4th July, 1859, at Grahamville, S. C., which was a masterly appeal to the passions of the South, on the questions of congressional protection and disunion. He had found at last, that those combinations were forming and that events were being so shaped as to justify his estimate of true statesmanship in the South, and such as to bring about the desired southern confederacy. He was unusually hopeful, and the success which he contemplated inspired him with unusual strength and vigor. The speech was in all respects conformable to the conclusion, which alone we quote, at this time. Said Mr. RHETT:

"Should the public regard, after I am gone, ever reach my humble services, let it be remembered that, after twenty years of earnest effort to preserve the Union, by keeping it within the limitations of the Constitution, and arresting its fatal tendency to despotism, I turned at last to the salvation of my native land (the South,) and in my latter years did all I could to dissolve her connection with the North, and to establish for her a southern confederacy."

During the year 1859, Mr. YANCEY was not an idle spectator of the work he set on foot; he wrote letters and made speeches on various occasions. JEFFERSON DAVIS, his greatest and most powerful coadjutor, was also active and zealous. We give an extract from a speech of the latter at Jackson, Miss., on the 6th July, 1859. He said:

"The success of such a party would indeed produce an irrepressible conflict." To you would be presented the question, will you allow the constitutional Union to be changed into the despotism of a majority? will you become the subjects of a hostile government, or will you,

outside of the Union, assert the equality, the liberty and sovereignty to which you were born? For myself, I say, as I said on a former occasion, in the contingency of the election of a President on the platform of Mr. Seward's Rochester speech, let the Union be dissolved. Let the "great, but not the greatest of evils" come. For as did the great and good Calhoun, from whom is drawn that expression of value, I love and venerate the Union of these States—but I love liberty and Mississippi more."

From the newspapers and the hustings the cry of disunion and revolution rose to State Legislatures and to Congress. Here the evidence of a purpose to dissolve the Union and to revolutionize the Government are so abundant that we have space for comparatively few. Governor GIST, of South Carolina, in his message to the Legislature of that State, November 28, 1859, uses the following language:

"With a united South our course would be clear, and our future glorious; we could enforce equality in the Union, or maintain our independence out of it. If, as I solemnly believe, we can no longer live in peace and harmony in the Union—notwithstanding the associations of the past, and the remembrance of our common triumph, (being treated as enemies and aliens, rather than brethren of the same family, and heirs of the same inheritance, by the North,) we can form a confederacy with ability to protect itself against any enemy, and command the respect and admiration of the world. \* \* \* The election of a Black Republican President will settle the question of our safety in the Union; and although the forms of the Constitution may be complied with, its vital principle will be extinguished, and the South must consent to occupy an inferior and degrading position, or seek new safeguards for her future security."

Gov. PERRY, of Florida, about the same time, in a like "State paper," said:

"True, Florida, as the youngest and least populous of the southern sovereignties, can only follow in action the lead of her sisters, yet this constitutes no reason why, at a time demanding the freest conference and frankest expression among those joined by a common destiny, she should remain silent. I believe that her voice should be heard in 'tones not loud but deep,' IN FAVOR OF AN ETHERAL SEPARATION from those whose wickedness and fanaticism forbid us longer to live with peace and safety. There are good grounds for the hope that most of the southern States will not consent to see the General Government pass into hands avowedly hostile to the South. If such is their purpose, it is not unlikely that they will prepare for the emergency of the approaching Presidential election."

Gov. MCWILLIE, of Mississippi, responded in pretty much the same spirit for that State. And in due time, the Senate of South Carolina, on the 19th December, passed the following preamble and resolution, which were concurred in in the House, with very slight, if any, alteration:

"Whereas, the State of South Carolina, by her ordinance of 1852, affirmed her right to secede from the Confederacy whenever the occasion should arrive justifying her, in her own judgment, in taking that step; and in the resolution adopted by her convention, declared that she forbore the immediate exercise of that right in deference to her sister States; and whereas more than seven years have elapsed since that convention adjourned, and in the intervening time, the assaults upon the institution of slavery, and upon the rights and equality of the southern States, have unceasingly continued with increasing violence, and in new and more alarming forms, South Carolina still deferring to her southern sisters, nevertheless respectfully announces to them that, in her judgment, THE SAFETY AND HONOR OF THE SLAVEHOLDING STATES IMPERATIVELY DEMAND A SPEEDY SEPARATION FROM THE FREE-SOIL STATES OF THE CONFEDERACY, and earnestly invites and urges her sister States of the South to originate the movement of southern separation in which she pledges herself promptly to unite."

"Resolved, That the State of South Carolina owes it to her own citizens to protect them and their property from every enemy, and that for the purpose of military preparation for any emergency, the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for military contingencies."

Mississippi and Alabama promptly responded, and passed resolutions PLEDGING THEMSELVES TO GO OUT OF THE UNION IN THE EVENT OF THE ELECTION OF A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT. They stand solemnly pledged to day to that course. In Congress, during the last session, we had similar expressions from various southern members, of which the following are but mere specimens:

MR. GARNETT, of Virginia, said:

"You must go home to your people, and must put down this abolition spirit. You must repeal the laws with which you have polluted your statute-books, to nullify that provision of the Constitution which protects the value of our slave property along the border, for we do not mean to stay in the Union until you have converted the border States into free States, and so demoralized and enervated our strength. You must pass laws at home, condemning and subjecting to the hands of justice the men who advise and the men who plot and the men who engage in these insurrectionary attempts. You must do for us what we do for foreign nations, and what they do for every country with which they are at peace. Unless you do pass such laws, unless you do put down this spirit of abolitionism, the Union will be short."

MR. DEJARNETTE, of Virginia, said:

"You may elect him President of the North; but of the South never. Whatever the event may be, others may differ, but Virginia, in view of her ancient renown, in view of her illustrious dead, in view of her *sic semper tyrannis*, will resist his authority."

MR. MOORE, of Alabama, said:

"I do not concur with the declaration made yesterday by the gentleman from Tennessee, that the election of a Black Republican to the Presidency was not cause for a dissolution of the Union. Whenever a President is elected by a fanatical majority at the North, those whom I represent, as I believe, and the gallant State which I in part represent, are ready, let the consequences be what they may, to fall back on their reserved rights and say, 'As to this Union, we have no longer any lot or part in it.'"

MR. PUGH, of Alabama, said:

"If, with the character of the Government well defined, and the rights and privileges of the parties to the compact clearly asserted by the Democratic party, the Black Republicans get possession of the Government, then the question is fully presented, whether the southern States will remain in the Union, as subject and degraded colonies, or will they withdraw and establish a southern confederacy of coequal homogeneous sovereigns?"

"In my judgment the latter is the only course compatible with the honor, equality, and safety of the South, and the sooner it is known and acted upon, the better for all parties to the compact."

MR. CURRY, of Alabama, said:

"However distasteful it may be to my friend from New York, (MR. CLARK,) however much it may revolt the public sentiment or conscience of this country, I am not ashamed or afraid publicly to avow that the election of William H. Seward or Salmon P. Chase, or any other such representative of the Republican party upon a sectional platform, ought to be resisted to the disruption of every tie that binds this Confederacy together."

MR. GARTRELL, of Georgia, said:

"I need not tell what I, as a southern man, will do—I think I may safely speak for the masses of the people of Georgia—that, when that event (the election of a Republican President) happens, they, in my judgment, will consider it an overt act, a declaration of war, and meet immediately in convention to take into consideration the mode and measure of redress. That is my position; and if that be treason to the Government, make the most of it."

MR. CRAWFORD, of Georgia, said:

"Now with regard to the election of a Black Republican President, I have this to say, and I speak the sentiment of every Democrat on this floor from the State of Georgia; we will never submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President. I repeat it sir—and I have authority to say—that no Democratic representative from Georgia on this floor will ever submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President."



Mr. BONHAM, of South Carolina, said:

"As to disunion, upon the election of a Black Republican, I can speak for no one but myself and those I have here the honor to represent; and I say, without hesitation that, upon the election of Mr. Seward, or any other man who indorses and proclaims the doctrines held by him and his party—call him by what name you please—I am in favor of an immediate dissolution of the Union.—And, sir, I think I speak the sentiments of my own constituents, and the State of South Carolina, when I say so."

Mr. KEITT, of South Carolina, said:

"Should the Republican party succeed in the next presidential election, my advice to the South is to snap the cords of the Union at once and forever."

Mr. SINGLETON, of Mississippi, said:

"You ask me when will the time come; when will the South be united? It will be when you elect a Black Republican—Hale, Seward, or Chase—President of the United States. Whenever you undertake to elect such a man to preside over the destinies of the South, you may expect to see us undivided and indivisible friends, and see all parties of the South arrayed to resist his inauguration."

Mr. REUBEN DAVIS, of Mississippi, said:

"Gentlemen of the Republican party, I warn you. Present your sectional candidate for 1860; elect him as the representative of your system of labor; take possession of the Government, as the instrument of your power in this contest of 'irrepressible conflict,' and we of the South will tear the Constitution in pieces and look to our guns for justice and right against aggression and wrong."

We have now seen how this southern organization, set on foot by Mr. YANCEY in May, 1858, has extended its influence over "legislatures and statesmen," as he vauntingly declared it would and should, in his letter to SLAUGHTER. It only now remains to show that the same influence has extended over and broken up the Democratic party. For in that letter let it not be forgotten that Mr. Yancey said of the power of this organization, it "WILL HOLD THE SOUTHERN ISSUE PARAMOUNT, AND WILL INFLUENCE PARTIES, LEGISLATURES, AND STATESMEN." Having asserted its influence, as we have undeniably shown, over legislatures and statesmen, a few words will serve to exhibit how it has affected the Democratic party. It was indispensable to the success of the scheme, that the Democracy should be broken up—that the southern wing should dissolve its connection with that of the North. And that necessity was successfully met and accomplished. As early as October, 1859, the Charleston *Mercury* put forth the following programme, by which the thing could be done:

"1. Let the Legislatures of the southern States, at their next meetings, distinctly declare the rights of the South, as plainly defensible from the Dred Scott case, accompanied with a resolution that they will vote for no one for the Presidency or Vice Presidency of the United States who does not plainly and distinctly affirm and support them without non-committalism, dodging, or equivocation."

"2. Should the Charleston Convention declare and affirm these rights, and nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency who distinctly support them, then the southern States will support such candidates; and should they be elected, proof will be afforded that the South may continue with safety in the Confederacy."

"3. But should the candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, thus fairly nominated by the Charleston Convention, be defeated in the presidential election, and the Republican or Abolition party succeed in electing their candidates, then the southern Legislatures, as soon thereafter as they shall successively assemble together, should recall their Senators and Representatives from the Congress of the United States, and invite the co-operation of their sister southern States to devise means for their common safety."

"4. But should the Charleston Convention refuse to declare and affirm the rights of the South, as deducible from the Dred Scott case, or nominate candidates who will not affirm and support them, then let the southern State nominate and support candidates of their own, plain and faithfully reflecting and supporting their rights."

"5. Should the southern States succeed in electing the sectional candidate, thus nominated, of course they will deem it a sufficient proof for the present of their safety in the Union."

"6. But should the southern States fail in electing the sectional candidates thus nominated, then let the same course be pursued as has been suggested in case the Democratic party be defeated with a candidate standing on the rights of the South, and the Black Republican or Abolition candidates be elected."

This programme was accepted and acted upon. The January, 1860, convention of Alabama, which appointed delegates to Charleston, was blessed with the presence of Mr. YANCEY. Indeed, he was always to be found wherever his presence would likely prove most effective. He was in the Alabama convention, was the leading and controlling spirit in it, and he thus laid down the law to his followers:

"To obtain the aid of the Democracy in this contest, it is necessary to make a contest in its Charleston Convention. In that body, Douglas adherents will press his doctrines to a decision. If the State-rights men keep out of that convention, that decision must inevitably be against the South, and that, either in direct favor of the Douglas doctrine, or by the indorsement of the Cincinnati platform, under which Douglas claims shelter for his principles. The State-rights men should present in that convention their demand for a decision, and they will obtain an indorsement of their demands, or a denial of these demands. If indorsed, we shall have a greater hope of triumph within the Union. If denied, in my opinion, the State-rights wing should secede from the convention, and appeal to the whole people of the South, without distinction of parties, and organize another convention upon the basis of their principles, and go into the election with a candidate nominated by it, as a grand constitutional party. But in the presidential contest a Black Republican may be elected. If this dire event should happen, in my opinion, the only hope of safety for the South is in a withdrawal from the Union before he shall be inaugurated; before the sword and the treasury of the Federal Government shall be placed in the keeping of that party. I would suggest that the several State Legislatures should, by law, require the Governor, when it shall be made manifest that the Black Republican candidate for the Presidency shall receive a majority of the electoral vote, to call a convention of the people of the State to assemble in time to provide for their safety before the 4th of March, 1861. If, however, a Black Republican should not be elected, then, in pursuance of the policy of making this contest within the Union, we should initiate measures in Congress which should lead to a repeal of all the unconstitutional acts against slavery. If we should fail to obtain so just a system of legislation, then the South should seek her independence out of the Union."

We beg of the reader to turn and read again that passage, and to imagine it to be printed in capital letters. We beg of him to read it a third time, and then run over in his mind the events at Charleston and Baltimore. The programme of a school examination, a theatrical performance, or a Fourth of July celebration, was never more exactly fulfilled. Here the unholy intrigue was to salute bright-eyed Success, or fall into the embrace of scowling Despair. At Charleston the demand was not granted, and the Alabama delegation, led personally by Mr. YANCEY, who was in the Convention for that purpose, went out of it, and were followed by those States which were in the secrets and sympathies of "the movement." The Alabama delegation were the first to set up the standard of rebellion to the party. The Alabama delegation were, in the

hands of Mr. YANCEY, clay in the hands of the potter. Other "cotton States" followed, as it was intended from the first they should do. On the very night of this secession from the Convention, on the night of the 30th April, at Charleston, Mr. Yancey addressed a crowd, in which he is thus reported in a Charleston journal:

"Mr. YANCEY appeared, and was proud and happy to see the South taking so proud a position in favor of her constitutional rights. He spoke of the seceding delegates as about to form the 'constitutional Democratic convention,' and the delegates who remained, as composing the 'rump convention.' He said this rump convention would speedily be in fact a sectional convention, and would represent only a faction of the free-soil sentiment of the North. He said the South must come up as a unit, and vindicate its constitutional rights. Every ultra sentiment was applauded with mad enthusiasm. Yancey said that *perhaps even now the pen of the historian was nibbed to write the story of a new revolution.* At this, some one in the crowd cried 'three cheers for the independent southern republic.' They were given with a will."

### FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS OF THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE UNION.

The Nashville *Patriot*, from which the foregoing history of the times is selected, has traced with a masterly hand the inception, progress, and development, down to the secession from the Democratic National Convention at Charleston, of the "CONSPIRACY TO BREAK UP THE UNION." It has shown by indisputable evidence, that the main reliance for the success of that conspiracy is the disruption of the Democratic party, and the sequence, as the plotters and disorganizers hope, of the election of a Black Republican to the Presidency, in which event they are solemnly pledged "to snap the cords of the Union at once and forever." We propose to take up the history of the conspiracy where the *Patriot* left off, to trace its progress to the present period, and supply further proofs that the end and aim of leading southern supporters of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE is—Disunion.

Upon their withdrawal from the Convention at Charleston the Secessionists assembled in St. Andrews' Hall. Let us briefly narrate their proceedings. Mr. JOHN C. PRESOX, of South Carolina, was called to the chair and made a short address. The following is an extract:

"We only know that the institutions of our country are imperilled, and we are here to preserve our rights and redress our wrongs. If we had submitted, we would have done that which would have driven us from the land of our forefathers, and deprived us of the liberty they fought for, and ultimately would have driven us from the spot on which their sacred ashes repose."

Mr. YANCEY, of Alabama, said:

"We were sent to the National Democratic Convention as delegates, but our mission has been fulfilled and we return as mere citizens from the late National Convention, which is now a mere sectional gathering. A few southern delegates still remain there, it is true, but it is in the hope of inducing others to forego their Black Republican purposes. He proposed that they should take no action, but to remain here and watch the proceedings of the Convention. If Douglas is nominated, it would then become their duty to present and recommend to the people of the United States candidates for President and Vice President, and on a national and constitutional basis, and therefore, a Southern basis. He thought no steps should be taken by the Seceding Convention until the proper time."

Mr. MEEK, of the same State, said:

"Any southern man that shall go into the Baltimore Convention would go there an approver of Squatter Sover-

eignty. The resolutions adopted at their adjournment invites the southern States to fill up the vacancies occasioned by our secession, declaring our seats vacant."

Mr. YANCEY, said:

"He approved the proposition of Judge Meek for appointing a committee to prepare an Address. He did not think it would either save or break the Union. The delegate from Georgia, in predicting a disunion movement by disunion leaders, looked to the Georgia delegation, but declined to name who and what he meant. Another delegate seemed to charge him (Yancey) with singing pœans to the Union."

Mr. JACKSON, of Georgia, in reply, said:

"I certainly never intimated that the gentleman from Alabama sang pœans to the Union. Certainly no one will ever charge him with any such an offence. My remarks were directed rather to my colleague, who, I thought, was placing Georgia in a wrong position. He did not wish Georgia to be placed in the position of singing pœans to the Union."

Mr. HOOKER, of Mississippi, said:

"We are no longer delegates to the other Convention. We separated from them on principle, and he was unwilling that they should carry them to Baltimore as an adjournment to that Convention. If we adjourn without doing anything or saying anything, we will stultify ourselves; and if we follow them to Baltimore, we shall lose all the moral effect of this movement. Make our nominations now, manfully and boldly. We are here for an object and purpose, and if we go home without action we will be merely denounced."

The Convention, as it was styled, finally adjourned, without any definite action, to meet at Richmond, on the 11th day of May. It is apparent from the proceedings at St. Andrews' Hall, of which we have given enough for a clear understanding of the whole, that the Seceders considered their connection with the Democratic National Convention permanently dissolved. As Mr. YANCEY pointedly said, they considered that their "mission had been fulfilled." In the language of Mr. HOOKER, of Mississippi, they were "no longer delegates to the other Convention"—that from which they seceded. They had no intention of following the Convention to Baltimore, until the address of the "Immortal Nineteen" southern Senators and Representatives, inviting and urging them to resume their seats in the Convention which should re-assemble on the 18th of May, was issued. That celebrated paper held out to the Seceders the inducement, for which its signers had no authority whatever, that the "platform" would be modified at Baltimore to meet their demands. And, "if your demands be not complied with," said the address to the Seceders, "you can secede again." Subsequent events justify the belief that the real purpose connected with the appearance of the Seceders at Baltimore, was to effect a larger secession from the Convention—a secession extending, if possible to all the southern States, and to such of the delegates from the North as held office under the Federal Administration. Of these office-holders there were some fifteen or twenty.

The Seceders at the appointed time, on the 11th of May, came together again at Richmond, to which Convention, as well as to Baltimore, all of them had been accredited, meanwhile, some regularly, and others irregularly, except the delegations from Florida and South Carolina, whose commissions confined them to Richmond alone. They adjourned over on the second day, until the 23d of May, and repaired to Baltimore—all of



them who held "roving commissions"—to demand the seats in the adjourned Convention which they had vacated at Charleston. They demanded admission into a body which their leader, Mr. YANCEY, had denounced in St. Andrews' Hall, at Charleston, as "a mere sectional gathering, and contemptuously termed '*the late National Convention.*'" They demanded seats in the Convention, with this same Mr. YANCEY at their head, although he had declared, but a few weeks before, at Montgomery, in a public speech, that, "the seceding States could not be represented, and at the same time preserve their honor untarnished, and not have their high moral position demoralized and degraded."

#### WHY THE SECEDERS DEMANDED ADMISSION AT BALTIMORE.

It was mysteriously given out, about the time the Seceders met at Richmond, that if they would seek admission at Baltimore, and should be refused, Virginia, and a majority of the other southern States that had not seceded at Charleston, would unite in the bolt. And there was a further assurance, it was said, that a like result would occur, if the "platform" was not reconstructed to suit the wishes of the Secessionists. At all events, it was apparent early at Baltimore, that upon one or the other of these pretexts, a further secession was inevitable. It came, as was anticipated, on the pretext that "bogus delegates" were admitted from Alabama and Louisiana, whereas in truth it was premeditated and prearranged, and had no other or better justification than the refusal of the Convention to admit the Seceders from those States who had no shadow of authority to seek admission. *They* were in fact the "bogus delegates," and were rightly rejected.

#### THE MARYLAND INSTITUTE NOMINATIONS.

The Seceders, with their number increased by the fresh secession at Baltimore, instigated by the Administration, acting upon its office-holders, and by candidates for the Presidency whose weakness had been made manifest at Charleston, assembled at the Maryland Institute, and nominated JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE for the Presidency, and JOSEPH LANE, for the Vice Presidency. Of the original seceders all were present but South Carolina; and there were a number present who were mere political waifs. However, for want of space, we shall not go into these details. It is sufficient to say, it was an assemblage of bolters, disorganizers, and disunionists, whose acts are entitled to no respect whatever, and *with whom no National Democrat can hold FELLOWSHIP OR COMMUNION.* Subsequently, a portion of the seceders from the South returned to Richmond, where their Convention had been adjourned from day to day from the 18th of June, and BRECKINRIDGE and LANE were nominated again.

#### DISUNION SUPPORTERS OF BRECKINRIDGE AND LANE.

We continue the proof which the article from the Nashville Patriot presents in part, that

BRECKINRIDGE and LANE are the candidates of Disunionists. The record is readily made up.

Mr. IVERSON, of Georgia, in the Senate, on the 6th of January 1859, said:

"The election of a northern President, upon a sectional and anti-slavery issue, will be considered enough to justify secession. Let the Senator from New York [Mr. Seward] or any other man avowing the sentiments and policy enunciated by him in his Rochester speech, be elected President of the United States, and, in my opinion, there are more than one of the southern States that would take *immediate steps* towards separation. And, sir, I am free to declare here, in the Senate, that whenever such an event shall occur, for one, *I shall be for disunion*, and shall, if alive, exert all the powers I may have in urging upon the people of my State the necessity and propriety of an *immediate separation.*"

Mr. TOOMBS, the colleague of Mr. IVERSON, in the Senate, on the 14th of February, 1860, said:

"When that time comes, freemen of Georgia, redeem your pledge; I am ready to redeem mine. *Your honor is involved, your faith is pledged.* I know you feel a stain as a wound; your peace, your social system, your firesides, are involved. Never permit this Federal Government to pass into the traitorous hands of the Black Republican party. It has already declared war against you and your institutions. It every day commits acts of war against you: it has already compelled you to arm for your defence. Listen to "no vain babblings," to no treacherous jargon about "overt acts;" they have already been committed. Defend yourselves; the enemy is at your door; wait not to meet him at the hearthstone—meet him at the door-sill, and drive him from the temple of liberty, or pull down its pillars and involve him in a common ruin."

Capt. B. H. RUTLEDGE, at the BRECKINRIDGE and LANE ratification meeting in Charleston, South Carolina, said:

"The operation of the Richmond Convention has set on foot a movement in which the whole South joins; so far, at least, the South appears united. Let us hope, let us pray to God, that it will continue united, one and inseparable, upon the vital issue which will come upon us if Lincoln is elected. This would be the last insult which could be offered to a free people."

"Upon such an event, every operation of the Federal Government ought to be made to stop within the limits of every Southern State. No judge should administer Federal justice; no collector should collect Federal customs throughout the whole South. No Southern man should consent to hold office under a commission signed by an Abolition President; and it will be for the people of the South to say whether any Northern man shall be permitted to enter any of the State lines with such intent."

Gen. W. E. MARTIN, a South Carolina delegate to the Richmond Convention, at the same meeting, said:

"The South, I am sure, is not more divided than were the American colonies in the Revolution. The great feeling with us, antagonistic to resistance, is love of the Union. Yet, deplorable as I consider this sentiment, in this aspect, it is not more powerful for mischief than was the loyalty of our ancestors to the British Crown. We see, however, that they who entered the struggle with no view to separation from the mother country, yet happily attained that end; and so it may be, and I trust will be, with the South. Circumstances of late have enabled me to judge of the state of sentiment in the Southern States. If the delegations from Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Texas, Louisiana and Georgia reflect the opinion of the people—and it is but fair to think they do—then there is much hope for the South."

Mr. R. BARNWELL RHETT, at the same meeting, said:

"Now, my friends, this consolidation is culminating into the Presidential election. We have now going on a struggle; we have now, at last got the two sections of the Union pitted against each other."

"If we are successful, there is a trust, at least, of happy and better days."

on the contrary, the Black Republicans succeed in making Lincoln and Hamlin, who will openly advocate slavery be abolished throughout the whole world, have we have to look to ourselves. \* \* I am very weary of seeing the South pass resolutions. I am sick at heart of vain attempts to hold out the olive branch, when we should grasp the sword."

Hon. W. PORCHER MILES, the Representative in Congress of the Charleston district, at the same meeting, spoke as follows:

"We said Douglas's notions of squatter sovereignty are unconstitutional, and the South could not accept him as their standard-bearer. Yet it was Douglas or nobody; Douglas or defeat; and so it is, the great Democratic party has been disbanded. I do not regret it. Great as that party has been; great as its triumphs; worthy as its services, when that party, or any great party, becomes subservient to the will of the mobocracy, and will tear away constitutional principles for the purpose of transient success, I say perish such party, no matter what may be the result."

"How do we stand now? The South stands upon her own platform, dependent upon her own strong arm for support. We have determined to support two men who have cordially and heartily indorsed the platform with a Southern code. In that respect, we will have, for the first time, the South standing together in solid phalanx. I know both these gentlemen who are our candidates. They are both able, and I believe them both to be sound."

The resolutions of the meeting were not less significant than the speeches. We have space for one only, which shows that the South Carolina disunionists support BRECKINRIDGE and LANE as the candidates of the Junta which met at Richmond. Here it is:

"Resolved, That we heartily approve of the proceedings of the Richmond Convention, and will uphold the principles that Convention has announced, and the candidates it has nominated for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States."

Gen. JOHN McQUEEN, a representative in Congress from South Carolina, made a speech on the 4th of July, at Bennettsville, in that State, of which a sketch is given in the local paper—*Son of Temperance*. It says:

"He reviewed the Federal politics of the day, cordially indorsed the nomination of Breckinridge and Lane for the Presidency and Vice Presidency—said they were good and true men for the South to support, and would maintain the constitutional rights of the Confederacy, and should be supported by every Southern man. \* \* If they submit, and permit Lincoln to be inaugurated President, without resistance and seceding from the Union, in such an event he, for one, believed that we were a degraded people, and a thousand times more than the Colonies were under Great Britain. He counseled secession of the South from the Union, if a Black Republican was elected President of the Government, for it would be an open declaration of an irrepressible conflict against our peculiar institutions, which are as dear to us as our lives."

Hon. LAWRENCE M. KEITT, another representative in Congress from South Carolina, in a recent letter, said:

"But, should the Black Republican party obtain power, and the South remain passive—what then? While I invoke co-operation—while I appeal to the States around us to be true to their honor—yet, if these fail, I will counsel this State alone, if necessary, and at all hazards, to secede from the Union."

\* \* \* \* \*

"This Union is just as travelers tell us many Eastern habitations are; a palace to look upon; all fair on its outside, and presenting the appearance of a house that should last for generations; but the master puts his walking-stick or his boot heel through the rafters, and he finds that the white ants have eaten all the substance out of the timbers, and that all that he sees about him is a coating of paint, which an intrusive blow may disperse in a cloud of dust. The skirting boards have already perished, the rafters are now ready to tumble in."

Ex-Governor HUBBARD, of Alabama, one of the seceders at Charleston, recently said:

"Resistance! Resistance! to death, against the Government is what we want now."

## MR. BRECKINRIDGE COUNSELS RESISTANCE.

We have reached the culminating point in this history; we have to present the evidence now that JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE sympathizes with his disunion supporters, and counsels resistance in the event of the election of LINCOLN to the Presidency. Hear him in his speech at Frankfort, his home in Kentucky, on the 21st of December, 1859:

"I have seen the growing evidences for the last few years, culminating recently into proof, of the determination of the Republicans to take possession, if possible, of the Government, for the purpose I have described. And I have seen in the representatives of the lower southern States a most resolute and determined spirit of resistance. In the meantime I perceive a sensible loss of that spirit of brotherhood, that feeling of love for a common country, that favor of loyalty, which is at last the surest cement of the Union; so that in the present unhappy state of affairs, I was almost tempted to exclaim that we are DISSOLVING, week by week and month by month. The threads are gradually fretting themselves asunder; and a stranger visiting Washington might imagine that the Executive of the United States was the President of two hostile Republics."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Resistance in some form is inevitable. Some members of the Confederacy may contemplate it in the form of a separate political organization. Kentucky, while a single ray of hope penetrates the thick darkness, will resist under the Constitution and within the Union. Resistance, I repeat, is certain."

"We cannot delude ourselves with the thought that the dangers that menace us are afar off, nor should others delude themselves with the thought that there will be no resistance. Constitutional resistance we contemplate to the latest moment, even against unconstitutional attacks. But when the subject of contest reaches the homes and fire-sides of a people, who is wise enough to predict or control the progress of events?"

"Perhaps the most imminent danger springs from the possible action of certain members of the Confederacy. The representatives from South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, not to mention other southern states, say that they represent their constituents—nay, that they scarcely go so far as their constituents—and most of them declare that they are ready at any moment for a separate organization. Some of the southern Legislatures have passed resolves of this character, and we may safely assume that is the true feeling of the people."

That speech pledges Mr. BRECKINRIDGE as fully as R. BARNWELL RHETT, or WILLIAM L. YANCEY is pledged to resistance. Unless he "meanly deserts his friends," Mr. BRECKINRIDGE like Mr. TOOMBS, will "listen to no vain babblings, to no treacherous jargon about 'overt acts,'" if the Republicans elect their candidate. No, he will counsel Kentucky then, as Mr. TOOMBS has counseled the people of Georgia to defend themselves, to drive the enemy from the temple of liberty, "or pull down its pillars, and involve him in a common ruin." What will that be but treason,—treason against the Union, and treason against the Constitution which in "his high office" Mr. BRECKINRIDGE has sworn to support. He should ponder well, the burning denunciation which HENRY CLAY pronounced against R. BARNWELL RHETT, of South Carolina, in the Senate, in 1850. Said the Great Kentuckian on that occasion,—"If he, (Mr. RHETT) pronounced the sentiment attributed to him of raising the standard of

disunion and of resistance to the common Government, whatever he has been, if he follows up that declaration by corresponding overt acts, *he will be a traitor, and I hope he will meet the fate of a traitor.*" Let Mr. BRECKINRIDGE take warning in time.

It was that Frankfort speech which commended him to the Southern Secessionists. It was that speech which made him the leader of the column which would have been headed otherwise by JEFFERSON DAVIS, or WILLIAM L. YANCEY. Listen to the testimony of Gen. W. E. MARTIN, of South Carolina, a delegate to the Richmond Convention, from whose speech at the ratification meeting we have already had occasion to cite. Speaking of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE he said:

"Having read carefully his speech delivered at Frankfort, Kentucky, when he could not have expected a nomination, I am now better satisfied that he is a State-rights man of the strictest school—more satisfied than I was when I gave him my vote at Richmond. In that speech he lays down a broad ground—a ground that I will close my remarks with, and save me a great deal of what I intended otherwise to say. He tells his people that the Democratic party was a very good thing in itself, but they were not to rely upon the Democratic party or any party. They were to rely upon themselves. THE SOUTH MUST RELY UPON ITS OWN STRONG ARM, and be prepared for any and every emergency."

An extract or two from Southern newspapers in the interest of the Secessionists, and we shall close the disunion record, forever, we hope.

#### *From the Camden (Ala.) Democrat.*

"We run up our flag to-day for BRECKINRIDGE and LANE, the Democratic nominees for President and Vice-President of the United States. We have unwaveringly contended for the last ten years that it would be better (for all concerned) to make two or more distinct governments of the territory comprising the United States of America—and that such will ultimately be done, there can be no sort of doubt; but it should be done with fairness and justice to every section of the Union; and believing that the party to which we belong is the only reliable one to carry out this measure, and secure to our own section all her rights, we intend to battle for its principles to the fullest extent of our ability."

#### *From the Montgomery (Ala.) Mail.*

"Run three Presidential tickets against Lincoln, thereby giving Lincoln the best chance for election. After Lincoln is elected, some Southern communities—most of them, perhaps—will refuse to let a Postmaster, appointed under his Administration, take possession of the office. Then the United States authorities will be interposed to 'enforce the laws.' Then the United States authorities will either be shot down, or they will shoot somebody down. Then the people of the community will rise up against the United States Government, and will be sustained by neighboring communities, until civil war, with all its horrible butcheries, envelops the land in a shroud of blood and carnage."

#### *From the Cahawba (Ala.) Slaveholder.*

"THE SOUTHERN TICKET.—We hoist to-day, as our choice of nominated candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, the names of John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and Joe Lane, of Oregon.

Our selection is made with special reference to the principles we have heretofore advocated, the most prominent, controlling of which is an union of the Southern people for the protection of our Southern institutions."

Such are the doctrines inculcated by the leading supporters of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE. What are they but open, rank disunion, and whither do they tend but to the destruction of the Constitution, and the desolation of the country? What friend of the Union, what lover of constitutional liberty can read this dark catalogue of treason without a shudder? "Dissolve the Union, tear the Constitution in pieces, and look

to our guns for justice," exclaim the southern supporters of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE, if LINCOLN be elected! And yet, they counselled secession at Charleston, forced further secession at Baltimore, disrupted the Democratic party, and set up a sectional organization, all of which increases and multiplies LINCOLN's chances of election.—What for? To wage war upon a mere abstraction. To crush out, if possible, the choice of three-fourths of the Democracy of the Union—STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, for whom the South, with the same opinions then for which the Secessionists so bitterly denounce him to-day, on the last ballot that his name was before the Cincinnati Convention, cast *seventy three* of their one hundred and twenty votes. That was the ostensible cause of the secession. But with the deep, designing leaders who planned and plotted from the beginning for discord and disorganization in the Democratic ranks, disunion, and a southern confederacy were and are the prospects ahead. Let the masses ponder these things well.

Thank God no disunionists sustain STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS and HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON. Not one that we know. Instinctively they have banded together as one man under the flag of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE. Why? They could control BRECKINRIDGE, if he were elected, and mould him to their purposes, and they know it. Defeated, they have assurance, that BRECKINRIDGE and LANE will either aid them, or oppose no obstacle to "the disruption of every tie that binds this Confederacy together," in the event of LINCOLN's election. To support such a ticket is, therefore, to league with disunionists, and countenance treason. Where is the Democrat who reveres the memory of JACKSON, and remembers the lofty stand which he maintained against the nullifiers of South Carolina, who will so degrade himself as to become the tool of the crafty plotters in the conspiracy, which has been tracked step by step, to break up the Union? Where is the Old Line Whig, who honors the grave of HENRY CLAY—the man whose life was made up of sacrifices for his country—who will insult his ashes by uniting with the enemies of the glorious Union which he loved so well? There should be, can be, must be no hesitation with such men. The path of duty and honor is straight before them. They must tread it with an unflinching step. They must bear aloft the flag of their country, and stand fast by the noble sentiment of DOUGLAS' letter of acceptance: "THE UNION MUST BE PRESERVED. THE CONSTITUTION MUST BE MAINTAINED INVIOLE IN ALL ITS PARTS." Thus only can a well regulated, conservative government be maintained, and the rights of every section upheld. Let all, then, who value the Union which is coeval with our political existence, and are ready to defend it, bury old animosities, forget past prejudices, and rally around the MAN OF THE PEOPLE, in this the hour of the country's peril. Clansmen of the Constitution! be firm, vigilant, and united in action, that you may scatter its enemies, and preserve it inviolate from the ruthless assaults of northern fanatics, as well as southern disunionists.

# APPENDIX.

## THE SENATE RESOLUTIONS—PROTECTION TO SLAVE PROPERTY IN THE TERRITORIES.

The celebrated resolutions of Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS, of Mississippi, with respect to slave property in the Territories, are familiar to the country. We purpose to insert them here, and show from the record, that their supporters in the Senate refused to protect slave property in Kansas, although it is indisputable that the Legislature has repealed all laws for its protection. The resolutions are as follows:

"1. *Resolved*, That, in the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the States adopting the same acted severally as free and independent sovereignties, delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the Federal Government for the increased security of each against dangers, domestic as well as foreign; and that any intermeddling by any one or more States, or by a combination of their citizens, with the domestic institutions of the others, on any pretext whatever, political, moral, or religious, with a view to their disturbance or subversion, is in violation of the Constitution, insulting to the States so interfered with, endangers their domestic peace and tranquility—objects for which the Constitution was formed—and, by necessary consequence, tends to weaken and destroy the Union itself.

"2. *Resolved*, That negro slavery, as it exists in fifteen States of this Union, composes an important portion of their domestic institutions, inherited from their ancestors, and existing at the adoption of the Constitution, by which it is recognized as constituting an important element in the apportionment of powers among the States and that no change of opinion or feeling on the part of the non-slaveholding States of the Union, in relation to this institution, can justify them, or their citizens, in open or covert attacks thereon, with a view to its overthrow; and that all such attacks are in manifest violation of the mutual and solemn pledge to protect and defend each other, given by the States respectively on entering into the constitutional compact which formed the Union, and are a manifest breach of faith, and a violation of the most solemn obligations.

"3. *Resolved*, That the union of these States rests on the equality of rights and privileges among its members; and that it is especially the duty of the Senate which represents the States in their sovereign capacity, to resist all attempts to discriminate either in relation to persons or property in the Territories, which are the common possessions of the United States, so as to give advantage to the citizens of one State which are not equally assured to those of every other State.

"4. *Resolved*, That neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature, whether by direct legislation or legislation of an indirect and unfriendly character, possess power to annul or impair the constitutional right of any citizen of the United States to take his slave property into the common Territories, and there hold and enjoy the same while the territorial condition remains.

"5. *Resolved*, That if experience should at any time prove that the judicial and executive authority do not possess means to insure adequate protection to constitutional rights in a Territory, and if the territorial government should fail or refuse to provide the necessary remedies for that purpose, it will be the duty of Congress to supply such deficiency, within the limits of its constitutional power.

"6. *Resolved*, That the inhabitants of a Territory of the United States, when they rightfully form a constitution to be admitted as a State into the Union, may then, for the first time, like the people of a State when forming a new constitution, decide for themselves whether slavery, as a

domestic institution, shall be maintained or prohibited within their jurisdiction; and they shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."

"7. *Resolved*, That the provision of the Constitution for the rendition of fugitives from service or labor, without the adoption of which the Union could not have been formed, and that the laws of 1793 and 1850, which were enacted to secure its execution, and the main features of which, being similar, bear the impress of nearly seventy years of sanction by the highest judicial authority, should be honestly and faithfully observed and maintained by all who enjoy the benefits of our compact of union; and that all acts of individuals or of State Legislatures to defeat the purpose or nullify the requirements of that provision, and the laws made in pursuance of it, are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect."

These resolutions were introduced in the Senate on the first day of March; were discussed for weeks and weeks in caucus and in the Senate; and finally voted upon and passed on the 25th day of May, 1860. Mr. CLINGMAN, of North Carolina, then moved the following resolution to come in after the fourth of Mr. DAVIS' series:

"*Resolved*, That the existing condition of the Territories of the United States does not require the intervention of Congress for the protection of property in slaves."

Mr. BROWN, of Mississippi, moved to amend Mr. CLINGMAN's resolution by striking out the word "*not*," and thus make it affirmative in its character. That amendment was rejected by the following vote:

YEAS—Messrs. Brown, Clay, Iverson, Johnson, of Arkansas, and Yulee—5.

NAYS—Messrs. Benjamin, Bigler, Bingham, Bragg, Bright, Chandler, Chesnut, Clark, Clingman, Collamer, Crittenden, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Fitzpatrick, Foot, Green, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Hammond, Hemphill, Hunter, Johnson, of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Latham, Mallory, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Sebastian, Slidell, Ten Eyck, Toombs, Trumbull, Wade, Wigfall, and Wilson—43.

Mr. CLINGMAN's resolution was then adopted, but was reconsidered at a subsequent stage of the proceedings and rejected. The vote on its adoption was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Bigler, Bingham, Bragg, Chandler, Clark, Clingman, Collamer, Crittenden, Dixon, Doolittle, Foot, Grimes, Hale, Hamlin, Harlan, Johnson, of Tennessee, Kennedy, Latham, Polk, Pugh, Simmons, Ten Eyck, Toombs, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson—26.

NAYS—Messrs. Benjamin, Bright, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Davis, Fitzpatrick, Green, Hammond, Hunter, Iverson, Lane, Mallory, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Powell, Rice, Saulsbury, Sebastian, Slidell, Wigfall, and Yulee—23.

The vote on the motion to reconsider the vote by which Mr. CLINGMAN's resolution had been adopted was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Benjamin, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Davis, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hammond, Harlan, Hemphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Lane, Mallory,

Mason, Nicholson, Powell, Rice, Sebastian, Simmons, Slidell, Wigfall, Wilson, and Yulee—26.

YAYS—Messrs. Bragg, Clingman, Crittenden, Johnson of Tennessee, Latham, Polk, Pugh, and Toombs—8.

The resolution was then rejected without a division.

These proceedings, coupled with the rejection of an amendment of Mr. CLINGMAN to the fifth resolution of Mr. DAVIS, indicated that the Interventionists were really in earnest. That amendment was as follows:

*“Provided, That it is not hereby intended to assert the duty of Congress to provide a system of laws for the maintenance of slavery.”*

It was rejected by the following vote:

YEAS—Messrs. Clark, Clingman, Dixon, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamlin, Latham, Pugh, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, and Wilson—12.

NAYS—Messrs. Benjamin, Bragg, Bright, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Davis, Fitzpatrick, Green, Hammond, Hemphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Mallory, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Rice, Saulsbury, Sebastian, Slidell, Thomson, Toombs, Wigfall, and Yulee—31.

To show upon what bald pretences the Interventionists in the Senate acted, we shall produce here certain remarks of Mr. ALBERT G. BROWN, of Mississippi, on his amendment to the resolution of Mr. CLINGMAN, which was first passed and then rejected.

“Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I feel a little amazed at gentlemen so often declaring that this amendment is a mere naked declaration of opinion, which does not involve any principle. I think that this whole series of resolutions is nothing but a declaration of opinion. They look to no legislation—certainly no immediate legislation. The public mind is in a state of great anxiety on this subject. It has been discussed here until vast numbers of people have brought their minds to the conclusion *that legislation—immediate, positive, direct legislation—is necessary for their protection in the Territories. That has been the whole question in controversy.* The Senator from North Carolina brings forward a proposition to negative that idea—to declare to the public that, so far as the Senate is concerned, we think no such necessity exists. I, thinking the necessity does exist, propose so to amend his resolution as to assert the affirmative proposition.

*“But it seems that our friends will neither take the one nor the other horn of the dilemma; they will neither affirm that legislation is necessary nor that it is not necessary.* I pray you, Senators, what is it we have been discussing? *Cui bono* all this controversy, if at last we have no case? If there is nothing upon which we are called to act, why has the public mind been lashed like an ocean tempest-tossed into a fury? Has the ocean been lashed into a fury “to waft a feather or drown a fly?” Is this a mere controversy about nothing, or is it a controversy having in it deep and lasting and substantial substance? If it be so, then either the one side or the other of this proposition is true, and gentlemen cannot ignore it. After all that has been said in State conventions, in national conventions, in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and everywhere, until every man in the whole country

has taken sides upon the question, *you cannot shuffle it off by simply saying there never was any necessity for the agitation.* Why have you agitated it? Why has the whole session been consumed in the discussion of this question, if there was no necessity for action or expressing an opinion on one side or the other? From the beginning of this controversy, I, at least, have been sincere; I, at least, have believed that slave property required protection in the Territories; that it requires it now. That was my opinion fifteen months ago, when standing precisely where I do to-day. I enunciated it in a discussion with the Senator from Illinois. I thought the necessity existed then. Subsequent events have confirmed that conviction. From that day to this the whole series of measures that have been concocted in Kansas have been a series of measures against slavery.

*“I showed you, the other day, that Kansas had abolished slavery; that she had made it a penal offence for a master to seek to exercise his ownership over that property in the Territory, and exacts fines if any master dares to say, ‘that black man is my property.’”* All this, and more, has been done, and yet we are not convinced that there is any necessity for action. Sir, when will there be? I am struggling in the abyss, and calling for help. You stand by, and say, “Oh, my dear sir, if I thought you needed help, I would give it.” My house is burning down over my head; my wife and children are being driven before the flames. I appeal to my neighbors for help; but they fold their arms, and say, “Dear sir, if you would only show us the necessity, we would help you. *Sir, if the necessity does not exist now, tell me what state of circumstances will ever convince you that there is a necessity? This looks to me like a shirking of the responsibility of saying either the one thing or the other.*

“Now, Mr. President, since I am upon this subject, I desire to repel, in the most positive manner, imputations which have been more than once thrown out against me in connection with this subject. The Senator from Georgia (Mr. TOOMBS) the other day declared that he had listened with no degree of pleasure to the discussion which we had here on the 23d of February, 1859; and in his speech, which now lies before me, he intimated, in tolerably broad terms, that it was his opinion that I had opened that discussion for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to explain his course here. I desire to say, once for all, that all such imputations, all such insinuations are totally and entirely erroneous. In making that speech, I had the purpose which I avowed at the time. I believed then, as I have believed ever since, and do now believe, that statutory law was necessary to secure me in the right to slave property in the Territories. So believing, I so enunciated, not to give the Senator from Illinois, or any other man, an opportunity to speak, but to enunciate a principle which I believe to be sound, which then, and ever since, and now, I have believed to be vital to the South.

“So much for that. The Senator from Texas (Mr. WIGFALL) yesterday intimated very much

the same thing. I desire that he will take this general and positive disclaimer as much to himself as it is designed for the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia went on to criticise my speech delivered on the 23d February, 1859, not as it is reported, but as it is represented in the rejoinder of my antagonist on that occasion. Now, sir, I say in all kindness to the Senator from Georgia, and I am sure he will see the justice of it when I make the bare suggestion, that when the record was before him it would have been more just to criticise my own language than to criticise me upon language put into my mouth by others.

"I admit and claim, as loudly as the Senator from Georgia, that my slave property is in a Territory under theegis of the Constitution, and entitled as much to protection as anybody else's property; *but whose property in a Territory is protected by the Constitution, unaided by statutory law.* This very session I took up the laws of Kansas, and showed that every other species of property known to the land was protected by positive statutory legislation in Kansas except slave property. Sir, they have got their horse code, their cow code, their sheep code, their dry-goods code, and their wet-goods code. *They have a code of laws for the protection of everything except slave property. To that they have not only denied protection by non-action, but they have repealed the laws affording it protection, and have pronounced penalties, as I said before, against the master who should undertake to claim his property.*

"Now, sir, for this state of things, what is the remedy? He says he utterly repudiates my remedy; utterly repudiates the idea that Congress is to interpose in any direct manner. Then what does he propose?

"In plain English, the Senator from Georgia proposes as a remedy for all these evils, that we repeal the congressional charter and reduce the people of Kansas, who are evidently disobedient to the laws, disregardful of their constitutional obligation, to a mere state of dependency upon the Federal Government. The remedy he suggests is this, if I understand him: that the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall send out a Legislative Council, a Governor and secretary, and three judges, and that they shall make the laws for the Territory. That I take to be, in plain terms, the mode.

"Mr. TOOMBS. One of the modes"



"Mr. BROWN. Now, sir, he says that the people of a Territory who have shown that they are regardless of their constitutional obligation, would not obey an act of Congress. Would a people, let me ask the Senator, who habitually disregard the authority of Congress, be obedient to the authority of a Legislative Council, appointed to rule over them by the President and Senate? Would your Legislative Council have any more authority, or any greater power, to enforce its edicts than would Congress? If you must send out a military force to compel obedience to the laws of the Governor and secretary

and the judges, why not send the same force to compel obedience to your laws? I ask the Senator from Georgia this question: whether he does not believe that the Constitution of the United States is in force in Kansas to-day?

"Mr. TOOMBS. Certainly."

"Mr. BROWN. He does. Then, sir, does not that Constitution guaranty to the people of Kansas the right of trial by jury; and would he not be compelled as much, under a law enacted by his Executive Council, to submit the case to a jury as I should be under an act of Congress? It is in the jury box, I apprehend, that you will find the difficulty in executing your laws. If not, where then? Certainly not in the judiciary, when they are appointed by a Democratic President and Democratic Senate.

"Now, Mr. President, gentlemen tell me that they are opposed to my slave code, as they choose to denominate it; they are opposed to the proposition which I have introduced and which I have so often and so earnestly, but with very feeble ability, advocated to give direct protection to slave property in the Territories by congressional action. Oh, no, they will not vote for that! The Senator from Georgia thinks there is some other remedy. Why has he not brought it forward? He is ready enough to say he will not vote for my proposition; he is ready enough to join in clamors against the policy which I have proposed to carry out; but he moves nothing practical. *Does anybody believe that you are to have protection to slave property under these resolutions that you are passing here? What protection will they afford to anybody? Who is to be punished under them? They do not wear even the outside semblance of law. What I want is a law which shall point the man who pilfers my slave property to prison-houses and strong bars and bolts, and tell him: "There, sir, will be your resting place, if you steal your neighbor's property."* If that be not sufficient, then I would point him to the gallows, and say: "Sir, that will be your end, if you keep not your hands off your neighbor's property."

"But these gentlemen seem to think that the negro thieves in the Territories, who spirit away slave property by the underground railroad, may be driven away gently as you would drive a flock of gentle doves; that you have nothing to do but to pass five resolutions, and they will scatter. Sir, they will laugh your resolutions to scorn, and go on just as they are now.  If there be any genuine purpose to afford protection to slave property in the Territories, do it now. All else than this is mere moonshine. 

"If there be such a purpose, then I would ask the honorable Senator at the head of the Committee on Territories, *why it is that a bill of mine, introduced ninety days ago, has been permitted to be from that day to this unacted on? Why was not the proposition of the Senator from Georgia incorporated into it instead of mine? Why not some policy of the Senator from Missouri himself? Why has not something been done?*

"Mr. GREEN. How long has it been before us?



"Mr. BROWN. IT HAS BEEN BEFORE YOU FOR NINETY DAYS.

"Mr. GREEN. I think not.

"Mr. BROWN. So you say; but here are stubborn facts. *The bill was referred to the committee on the 23d of February. This is the 24th of May. I think there is an interval of three months.*

"Mr. GREEN. It was not sent to us right away.

"Mr. BROWN. It was sent to the Clerk's desk at once, and I suppose the Secretary sent it to the committee.

"Mr. GREEN. The committee is not always in session. I will say, however, that it has been considered twice.

"Mr. BROWN. *Here, sir, we are closing the sixth month of the session, and nothing is done; and there is no purpose to do anything. This day's proceedings show why it was not done—the gentlemen do not think it necessary to act. It would have been better to say so at the beginning; simply pass a short resolution, saying to the country: "whatever may be your opinions, we do not think this slavery question should receive action."* That would have saved a vast amount of labor and trouble and toil everywhere. I never could have agreed that it was not necessary; but still, if the Senate, at an early day in December, had passed such a resolution, I, of course, would have desisted from all my efforts, simply protesting that I thought, notwithstanding the resolution, the necessity still existed. Up to to-day I supposed it was a general opinion that most Senators believed that some action was necessary—perhaps not the action contemplated in my bill, perhaps not that indicated by the Senator from Georgia, or that indicated yesterday by the Senator from Texas—but something. Now we are given to understand that nothing is to be done; that really there is no purpose to do anything, except pass these resolutions.

"I am content to give my vote. I think the southern people will give me credit for this: that believing they were entitled to protection, I have labored for it with all the zeal and ability that I possess. Many think there is no necessity, for positive action, for positive legislation, and therefore they will not press it. Very well, sir, be it so: I am responsible only for my own conduct, and for nobody else's. I act on my own conviction, and upon nobody else's. I have done what I thought was right, and I leave the consequences to take care of themselves."

Whoever reads the remarks of Gov. Brown must come to the conclusion, that all the clamor and agitation about protection to slave property in the Territories had reference solely to the position of Mr. Douglas. He was known to be an uncompromising advocate of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States, in the Territories, and the District of Columbia. And this new creed was prescribed with a view to drive him from the field. But let us return to the record. When the fifth resolution of his colleague came up for consideration, Mr. Brown

moved to strike out all after the word resolved and insert the following:

"That experience having already shown that the Constitution and the common law, unaided by statutory provision, do not afford adequate and sufficient protection to slave property, some of the Territories having failed, others having refused, to pass such enactments, it has become the duty of Congress to interpose and pass such laws as will afford to slave property in the Territories that protection which is given to other kinds of property."

There was a practical question—there was something more substantial than abstract resolutions. How did the Interventionists meet it? Let the vote on the amendment answer. Here it is:

YEAS—Messrs. Brown, Johnson of Arkansas, and Mallory—3.

NAYS—Messrs. Benjamin, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Cheanut, Clark, Clay, Clingman, Crittenden, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Fitzpatrick, Foot, Foster, Green, Grimes, Gwin, Hamlin, Harlan, Humphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Tennessee, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Sebastian, Slidell, Ten Eyck, Thomson, Toombs, Trumbull, Wigfall, Wilson, and Yulee—42.

So the amendment was rejected.

Well might Mr. Brown, after such a vote, exclaim—"We are three. We are a small band. This is as many as was required to save Sodom. *I think the Republic is safe.*"

To make the proof yet more complete, that the design of this agitation was not to correct existing evils, nor even to reach evils apprehended, we present a conversation between Mr. CRITTENDEN and Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS, as to the purpose of these Senate resolutions. Said Mr. CRITTENDEN, "I believe my honorable friend from Mississippi, who introduced these resolutions, did at the time he proposed them, *admit that there existed now no actual grievance calling for the interposition of this Government.*"

Mr. DAVIS, in reply, said—"As my friend from Kentucky refers to me, I would merely say that *I did not intend either to admit or deny the fact.* I considered the declaration of principle to be coeternal with the existence of our Government, and coextensive with the whole country, not necessarily dependent upon the particular fact in relation to any particular locality; and *neither intended to admit or deny.*"

Mr. CRITTENDEN subsequently observed, with great truth: "I think therefore, sir, if there is no case existing now, it will be still less likely to exist hereafter. *All this debate, all this earnest and zealous and heated controversy is merely in prospect of an evil which is only apprehended. None exists. When is it likely to exist, and where?* With every day I trust the danger of such a necessity is diminished. Kansas will soon be taken from the class of territorial governments. Where are we likely to have any such difficulty as that which these resolutions apprehend, of an assault made by Territorial Legislatures upon slavery within their Territories? Are there any slaves in Washington? Will there be any question about slavery in Utah? In New

Mexico? Why, sir, these are not regions to which you could by invitation carry slavery. Well, where is there to be a Territory hereafter formed in which any controversy whatever about slavery is likely to arise? Kansas disposed of, does there remain any territory to which slavery if invited would go? I know of none. I will not affirm it is so exactly in regard to every portion of our territory; but I believe there is none of sufficient importance to form a State which would be at all acceptable to the slaveholders, if permitted without the least hinderance to take possession of it. They can find a more genial climate, and a better soil on which to employ this labor."

It is only necessary to state in conclusion that Mr. Brown's bill to protect slave property in Kansas, which was a rescript of the Territorial statute which had been repealed, was reported adversely upon by Mr. JAMES S. GREEN, from the Committee on Territories, in the last days of the session of Congress, and that the report was concurred in by the Senate. Thus ended the "noise and confusion" over slave property in the Territories, so far as Congress is concerned, and it is probable that little will be heard of it after the Presidential election, especially as that election will drive the last nail in the coffin of Congressional intervention.

WASHINGTON, *August*, 1860.

## NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB ROOMS,

350 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, WASHINGTON, D. C.,

*August*, 1860.

The Committee will furnish the friends of DOUGLAS and JOHNSON the following CAMPAIGN DOCUMENTS:—*All orders sent will be promptly attended to.*

### *Non-Interference by Congress with Slavery in the Territories.*

SPEECH of HON. S. A. DOUGLAS, of ILLINOIS, in the *Senate*, May 15th and 16th, 1860.

This celebrated Speech has been stereotyped, from a new bold-face type, and comprised in a Pamphlet of 40 pages, printed on fine paper, and sold at the low price of \$2 50 per 100. It will be supplied to Clubs, and others, in lots of 5,000 and upwards at a time, at \$20 per 1,000.

SETS of STEREOTYPE PLATES, of DOUGLAS' SPEECH, 40 pages, and duplicates of 8 pages, so as to make even forms and save press work, &c., making in all 48 pages..... \$60

The same, 48 pages, blocked, ready for printing..... 70

SPEECH of HON. REVERDY JOHNSON, of Maryland, delivered before the Political friends of HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, at a Meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston, June 7th, 1860. To which is added the Letter of Hon. Reverdy Johnson, to the Chairman of the Douglas Meeting in New York, May 22d, 1860..... 16 pages,—per 1,000, \$10

REMARKS on POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY, as Maintained and Denied, respectively, by JUDGE DOUGLAS, and ATTORNEY GENERAL BLACK. By A SOUTHERN CITIZEN..40 pages, per 100, \$2 50 per 1,000, \$20

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IN THE TERRITORIES. The *DEMOCRATIC RECORD*, The purpose of this publication, is to exhibit the Democratic Record, as it was made by the Representative men of the Party, on the Doctrine of Popular Sovereignty in the Territories. 24 pages.....per 100, \$1 50—per 1,000, \$12 50

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY. By Hon. JOHN FORSYTH, of Alabama.....per 1,000, \$10

SENATOR CLINGMAN'S SPEECH on the SENATE RESOLUTIONS.....per 1,000, \$10

DOUGLAS' SPEECH on INVASION OF STATES.....per 1,000, \$10

DOUGLAS' SPEECH in reply to SEWARD.....per 1,000, \$5

SPEECH of SENATOR CLINGMAN, of North Carolina, against the Revolutionary movement of the Anti-Slavery party.....per 1,000, \$10

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND HIS DOCTRINES. To which are appended his votes in the House of Representatives on the Mexican War, on the Gott Resolution, and other questions of the day 16 pages.....per 1,000, \$10

SPEECH of HON. THOMAS J. BARR, of New York, in vindication of Catholic and adopted citizens.....per 1,000, \$10

SPEECH of HON. GEO. E. PUGH, of Ohio, in reply to Messrs. IVERSON and GREEN—per 1,000, \$20

SPEECH of HON. WM. MONTGOMERY, in reply to Mr. CURRY, of Alabama...per 1,000, \$10

ADDRESS OF NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE to the Democracy of the United States.....per 1,000, \$10

BRECKINRIDGE and LANE, ON POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY .....per 1,000, \$10

EXPOSITION OF THE CONSPIRACY TO BREAK UP THE UNION BY THE LEAGUE OF UNITED SOUTHERNERS.....per 1,000, \$10

Address:

J. J. JONES,

350 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.